



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

WEDNESDAY, February 20. May the President Admit New States?

IT is reported, and the report has not yet been contradicted, that the President is taking a fatherly interest in the internal affairs of Oklahoma. He has warned, it is said, the Constitutional Convention, which is engaged in framing the first fundamental law of the incoming State, that it must refrain from inserting in that law a provision forbidding the employment of armed private citizens by the railroads and other corporations. Such employment of private armed agents, especially for the suppression of strikes, has not been uncommon in the past.

It is such a curious theory that seems to possess Mr. Roosevelt's mind that it will repay examination. It seems that the President is of the opinion that he is the whole political power. Congress offends him if it does not agree with him and sustain all his theories and policies. In his relations to the judiciary department, too, Mr. Roosevelt, more than once, has indicated his belief that the President is the controlling force in the government, and that the judges do wrong, violate their duty, when they do not concur in his opinions on constitutional and other law. In this instance he is illustrating anew his theory that the President is the supreme power of the government, not bound to consult with any other power or department. Necessarily, therefore, the old theory that the other departments are coordinate with him, and independent of him, is, to his mind, exploded. More than this, in this case of Oklahoma he has assumed the rôle, and has enacted it most extravagantly, of the father of his people. He is denying to the people of the new State the right to govern themselves. On the one hand, he is usurping the powers of Congress; on the other, he is saying to the people of Oklahoma that they shall not govern themselves as they like, not

as they think that they ought to govern themselves, but as he thinks that they should be governed.

The first serious question is whether the President has the power which he seems to have assumed. Can he, under the Constitution, be the parental governor that he seeks to be? If he has such a power as he attempts to exert, he can, of course, frame the whole fundamental law of the State of Oklahoma. If, for example, he thought that it would be best for the new State, or a good example for neighboring States, that its Constitution should prohibit the sale of liquor; or if he thought that it should restrict the suffrage, or admit women to vote, or adopt the town-meeting methods of New England, or the city-government experiment of Galveston—it would be as much within his power to deny Statehood to Oklahoma if the convention did not meet his requirements on these subjects, as it is within his power to insist that Pinkertons shall not be excluded by the new Constitution. The exercise of this power would, indeed, make the President an autocrat not only over the admission of new States, but in framing their State governments and their fundamental laws. The acceptance of the right would endow him with the power which the Constitution has bestowed upon Congress, and would reverse the intent of constitutional law, for it would make a Constitution a grant from the Executive instead of an enactment by the people, by the application and interpretation of which the judicial power keeps the political power to the way in which the people intend it to walk.

“New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union,” is the language of the Constitution. The right to admit new States has been consistently interpreted. In the first place, it has been assumed that, certain physical, geographical and statistical conditions being satisfactory to Congress, the old Territory ought to be admitted as a new State if its people so desire, Congress simply requiring that the new State’s Constitution shall provide for a government republican in form. The power granted to Congress to “guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government” has been extended and applied so that Congress now demands, as it must, that each entering State shall possess a government republican in form when it presents itself for admission. Whether a State possesses a government republican in form is a question for the political power to deter-

mine. This was decided by the Supreme Court early in the history of the Government in the case of *Luther v. Borden*. By the political power the Supreme Court designated, in this instance, the legislative power, of which the President, as the possessor of a qualified veto, is part. Mr. Roosevelt, therefore, if he were to deny admission to Oklahoma for any reason except that its Constitution provided for a government not republican in form, would assume to himself the rights of the whole political power and of the whole legislative power of the Government. He would assume what never belonged to an English-speaking monarch, and what the Tsar has promised the Russian people to surrender.

Not only this, but he would violate the Act of Congress itself for the admission of Oklahoma, the Act of June 16th, 1906. By this Act the President is instructed to examine the new Constitution, and if it and the government provided for by it "are republican in form, and if the provisions in this Act have been complied with in the promotion thereof [provisions respecting the eligibility of voters, the manner of holding the election for delegates, etc.], it shall be the duty of the President of the United States . . . to issue his proclamation announcing the result of the election," this election being for the ratification of the Constitution. "Thereupon," continues the statute, "the proposed State of Oklahoma shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union, under and by virtue of this Act, on an equal footing with the original States." The Act provides all the conditions under which the State may be admitted. The principal one of those conditions is required by the Constitution itself; the others are required by the constitutional enabling Act. Under the Constitution the President has not the right to prescribe other conditions. Congress has not empowered him to do so. Congress could not thus empower him, for an attempt by it to do so would be a delegation of its legislative duty which it may not make. Congress itself could not now add to the conditions which are to be found in the Act of June 16th without a breach of its faith.

Even if such a condition should be forced upon the Constitutional Convention by the proper authority, *i. e.*, by Congress, and if the new State Constitution should be without the provision against which Mr. Roosevelt has issued his warning, the moment that the new State shall become part of the Union it will have

supreme control over its own Constitution. It may, therefore, amend it by inserting the provision which the President now warns it to omit. His effort, therefore, is not only in violation of the law of the land, but, for his own purposes, whatever they may be, it would be a futile violation.

THURSDAY, February 21.

Some Letters from Our Readers.

WE receive daily many letters from readers of the REVIEW. Some voice intelligent suggestions or criticism in intelligible phrase, others express earnest and, at times, violent dissent for no given reason, a few sound unstinted praise tickling to vanity, but hardly convincing when subjected to the severe test of dissociated judgment; but all are interesting because indicative of phases of thought or emotion, and none passes unheeded. This morning came:

“SIR,—Pardon me, a stranger, for addressing you, but I was interested in reading the first article under the head of the ‘Editor’s Diary,’ in your issue of January 4th, 1907, because it treats of a subject in which an instructive experiment is now being carried on in the State of New York.

“No one doubts President Roosevelt’s honesty of purpose—not even his most active opponents, and least of all, I judge, yourself. But many, like you, object to the multiplicity of his activities—not, I take it, as a man, but as the President. Perhaps he tries no harder to guide all departments of the Government than many of his predecessors; if so, his ability makes his activity more fruitful, hence more noticeable.

“The Governor of New York, on the other hand, with just as honest a purpose, has taken the opposite stand. His duties, he says, are defined in the Constitution, and it is only *his* duties that he has been elected to perform. The members of the Legislature have theirs marked out for them in the same instrument. The Governor refuses, not only to be dictated to by the members of the Legislature, but, for the same reason, to dictate to that coordinate branch of the Government, relying upon public opinion to force them to do their duty, instead of on his strong right arm of Gubernatorial power.

“Personally, I believe that the Hughes way is the coming way, and I earnestly hope so.

“But, in your article, it seems to me that you confuse two separate and unrelated things. The arrogation by the central Government to itself of powers hitherto belonging to and exercised by the States is a very different thing from the encroachment of the Executive on the powers and duties of the other branches of the Government. While the limitation of the powers of the central Government is the result of accident, the separation into coordinate branches with distinct powers is due to

the wisdom of the fathers based upon the experience of history. Not that the former is necessarily inconsistent with that wisdom, but it is not its product.

“ For a clear discussion of these questions, they must first be carefully distinguished. When that is done, I think it will appear that in neither respect is there, in the attitude of the ‘ clique’ at Washington, a menace to the liberty of the individual, except in so far as that is influenced by the effectiveness and virtue of the Government. Neither encroachment is, *in itself*, an abridgment of that liberty.

“ I am, sir, etc.,

“ GEORGE B. KELLER.

“ BROOKLYN, NEW YORK.”

Whether or not such encroachment be, *in itself*, an abridgment of personal liberty is a matter largely of interpretation; that it is *in effect*, which, after all, is the main point in issue, our casuistical correspondent inferentially admits. His easy assumption that “the limitation of the powers of the central Government is the result of accident,” we charitably assume to partake of the nature of jocularity.

“ SIR,—Allow one of your readers to say that in his opinion you are entitled to profound public thanks for the stand you are taking with regard to the President and his encroachments. Whatever his intentions, he is doing an enormous deal to blur public vision of matters vitally connected with the continuance of free institutions in this country—to advance us insensibly toward the forms of a monarchy—which will confirm to us the substance of which we already have no little. Commend us all to a reading of ‘Miller Arnold’s Lawsuit’ in the last volume of Carlyle’s *Friedrich*, but not to Carlyle’s conclusions respecting all such.

“ I am, sir, etc.,

“ HENDRICK KINNEY.

“ MADISON, WISCONSIN.”

It was surely an interesting lawsuit, and calculated to illustrate admirably the effect of monarchical resentment of apparent injustice applied by established courts in a specific case without regard to establishment of precedent; but Carlyle’s confused account seems almost opaque in the light of Macaulay’s more general depiction of the same king:

“ Most of the vices of Frederic’s administration resolve themselves into one vice—the spirit of meddling. The indefatigable activity of his intellect, his dictatorial temper, his military habits—all inclined him to this

great fault. He drilled his people as he drilled his grenadiers. Capital and industry were diverted from their natural direction by a crowd of preposterous regulations. There was a monopoly of coffee, a monopoly of tobacco, a monopoly of refined sugar. The public money, of which the King was generally so sparing, was lavishly spent in ploughing bogs, in planting mulberry-trees amidst the sand, in bringing sheep from Spain to improve the Saxon wool, in bestowing prizes for fine yarn, in building manufactories of porcelain, manufactories of carpets, manufactories of hardware, manufactories of lace. Neither the experience of other rulers nor his own could ever teach him that something more than an edict and a grant of public money was required to create a Lyons, a Brussels, or a Birmingham.

" For his commercial policy, however, there was some excuse. He had on his side illustrious examples and popular prejudice. Grievously as he erred, he erred in company with his age. In other departments his meddling was altogether without apology. He interfered with the course of justice as well as with the course of trade, and set up his own crude notions of equity against the law as expounded by the unanimous voice of the gravest magistrates. It never occurred to him that men whose lives were passed in adjudicating on questions of civil right were more likely to form correct opinions on such questions than a prince whose attention was divided among a thousand objects, and who had never read a law book through. The resistance opposed to him by the tribunals inflamed him to fury. He reviled his Chancellor. He kicked the shins of his judges. He did not, it is true, intend to act unjustly. He firmly believed that he was doing right and defending the cause of the poor against the wealthy. Yet this well-meant meddling probably did far more harm than all the explosions of his evil passions during the whole of his long reign. We could make shift to live under a debauchee or a tyrant, but to be ruled by a busybody is more than human nature can bear."

If we rightly suspect the parallel designed by our correspondent, Macaulay would seem to be preeminent in simple effectiveness.

" SIR,—You raise the question, 'Can Women be Friends?' and leave the conclusion to other 'more certain minds.' It has occurred to me in this connection that the lifelong friendship of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony is well worth citing as an instance of rare friendship between two women. On the occasion of Miss Anthony's eightieth birthday, which was celebrated at the Lafayette Square Opera-House in Washington, February 15th, 1900, Harriet Stanton Blatch, the daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, brought to Miss Anthony the greeting of her mother, and her address on that occasion was so remarkable that I am enclosing herewith a copy of it.

" I am, sir, etc.,

" ELIZABETH J. HAUSER."

"I bring to you, Susan B. Anthony, the greetings of your friend and coworker, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, greetings full of gracious memories. When the cause for which you have worked shall be victorious, then, as is the way of the world, will it be forgotten that it ever meant effort or struggle for pioneers; but the friendship of you two women will remain a precious memory in the world's history, unforgotten and unforgettable. Your lives have proved not only that women can work strenuously together without jealousy, but that they can be friends in times of sunshine and peace and stress and storm. No mere fair-weather friends have you been to each other.

"Does not Emerson say that friendship is the slowest fruit in the garden of God? The fruit of friendship between you two has grown through half a hundred years, each year making it more beautiful, more mellow, more sweet. But you have not been weak echoes of each other; nay, often for the good of each you were thorns in the side. Yet disagreement only quickened loyalty. Supplementing each other, companionship drew out the best in each. You have both been urged to untiring efforts through the sympathy, the help of the other. You have attained the highest achievement in demonstrating a lofty, an ideal friendship. This friendship of you two women is the benediction for our century."

We publish gladly this tribute to a friendship as unselfish and beautiful as our correspondent inadvertently admits it to have been rare.

"SIR,—'There is no Place in Heaven for Old Maids.' This cruel and crushing statement was made by a Carmelite father the other night while preaching a mission sermon at the Church of St. Bernard, in West Fourteenth Street. He also said that it was almost impossible for one not married or who did not become a nun to save her soul. While old maids, with the rest of the world, may treat with infinite scorn the prophecies of any one, even a priest, as to their chances of happiness after death, his second remark is of so serious a nature, affecting the character and reputation of many women, that it is as unfair as it is untrue.

"Furthermore, it is not inappropriate at this time to reply to the Reverend Father's criticism in the words of Susan B. Anthony: 'Any woman in the world will get married if the man she loves asks her.' If he does not, what can she do? To be able to marry some one else is not going to make her a happy woman and, we are sure, it is not going to make her a good one, no matter how many priests may bless the ring or assist at the ceremony.

"The Church of which this priest is a member has always been and still is the strongest advocate of celibacy of any Church of ancient or modern times, and its priests have from time immemorial trained and fortified souls to live in the state of life he deplores. In other words, they have been the consolers and comforters to sick and suffering souls

who have been denied every human consolation and who would otherwise have sought distraction in pleasure and probably in sin. Then, too, a Catholic girl knows if she makes an unfortunate marriage she has to put up with it. At any rate, she cannot secure a divorce and marry again without being excommunicated from the Church. The result is that the Catholic Church has, in this country at least, a larger percentage of unmarried women than any other denomination.

" Aside from all this, is it not rather ungallant to make rude and terrifying remarks to a class of people so useful to mankind in general? There is a lot of work to be done in the world, and many old maids are doing theirs as well as the priest does his. In addition to all the odd jobs which they formerly did, as trained workers they now nurse the sick, mind children, cook, bake, sew, teach (some have been known to preach), support fathers and mothers, educate the children of worthless brothers and brothers-in-law, and last, but by no means least, render substantial assistance to the support of all priests.

" The old maids who felt discouraged and dismayed by this father's statement should remember that greater priests and philosophers than he have said exactly the reverse. Among them St. Paul, who remarked: 'If you get married you do well; if you remain single you do better.' Wagner, in his delineation of a society that is vulgar and corrupt, thought fit to write words of passionate admiration for old maids; and Thackeray, that keen and delightful philosopher, has given us perhaps the truest and most pathetic picture of the lives of women in general who are born in humble circumstances, whom he poetically describes as 'sisters of charity without the romance and sentiment of sacrifice.'

" If the good father has any satisfying and satisfactory solution of the situation which he deplores (other than that promulgated by Brigham Young), he will be heralded by the old maids themselves as the greatest benefactor of his time. If he has not, what good can be achieved by making cynical remarks as to the present conduct and terrible predictions as to the future happiness of a class of helpless people who feel that in the great scheme of things they have been very inadequately taken care of?

" NEW YORK CITY."

Even spinsters ought not to attempt to justify their indefensible attitude towards the human race by misquoting the Scriptures from either unscrupulous design or treacherous memory. There is no record, authentic or otherwise, to our knowledge, of such an utterance as that so glibly attributed to Paul. His admonition was addressed, not to unmarried women, but directly to "any man" who might think he had behaved "uncomely"—or, according to the Revised Version, "unseemly"—towards a virgin of mature years; such an one, the apostle declared, though he "sinneth not," "doeth well" to keep his virgin; and,

he added, naturally: "So, then, he that giveth her in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage [*i. e.*, presumably marries her himself] doeth better." The inappropriateness, if not indeed downright dishonesty, of our correspondent's misquotation is therefore clearly apparent.

Paul's direct injunction was addressed to Timothy in these unmistakable words: "I will that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give no occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully." The excellence of this advice, as thus presented in the Authorized Version, was so obvious that the learned revisers ventured a change only in the most tentative manner. In point of fact, there can be little doubt that Paul's reference was really restricted to younger widows, not younger women, since he had just enjoined that none be enrolled as a widow "under threescore years old," because those who had not reached that age of reasonable discretion were accustomed to "desire to marry" and "to be idle, going about from house to house, and not only idle, but tattlers also and busybodies, speaking things which they ought not." Apparently, at the time of writing to Timothy, Paul regarded remarriage of the younger widows as the only effective remedy for harmful gossip; and yet, but a short time previous, he had written to his friends in Corinth, "I say to the unmarried and widows, 'It is good for them if they abide even as I"'; *i. e.*, as an old bachelor, since even then he was somewhat advanced in years.

On the whole, we must conclude that, although the clearest and wisest of teachers of his day in matters concerning men, when he undertook to treat of those pertaining specifically to women, and to widows especially, Paul's mind became confused. Curiously enough, the like might be said of nearly all of the great preachers who succeeded him—surely, at any rate, from the days of Knox to those of Beecher. For some inscrutable reason, each has seemed to lack the specific knowledge of feminine traits and inclinations derived from experience by many of us who are in other respects comparatively ill informed.

SIR.—"Why Not Tax Old Maids?" is the title and subject of an article in the 'Editor's Diary' of your number of January 4th, 1907. It caught my eye precisely because I am that thing maligned in your paper, a

deliberate spinster; and because I have reflected, much and often, on the position old maids have assumed in the community. In the first place, let me defend those members of society from your charge of their being 'clogs'—they are, according to my rather large experience among them, particularly useful citizens: in replacing tired mothers (or dead ones) in the care of their children, in doing 'nurse,' or 'governess' work, for nothing but the joy of helping, with all the love and devotion of the real mothers; in doing faithful service on charitable boards, where they give time and thought unstintingly; and *officially*, as teachers in public schools, where a recent law forbids a married woman to serve!

" If these are some of the uses of spinsters, there is another reason why they should not be taxed, further than is already the case, if they happen to hold 'trust property,' and that is the fact that they are unrepresented by a *vote*. Now, I am not in favor of giving universal suffrage to women (any more than to men); but should the suffrage be given to any women, it certainly belongs to those single women, or widows who, though they may hold property on which they do pay taxes, are unable to influence in any way legislation which affects their interests, while the laboring men to whom they pay \$1.50 to \$2.00 a day may vote against them at any election.

" Property ought to have taxation with representation, whether held by a man or a woman; but as long as spinsters have no rights in the management of local governments, they should not be taxed for being single. As for your view that every woman should marry, whether she finds a congenial mate or not—the idea is too unreasonable to require a reply from

A RESPECTABLE SPINSTER.

" ON BOARD S.S. 'CEDRIC.'

The complacently boastful admission of our correspondent that she is a "deliberate" spinster, of course, confirms our assertion that no woman fails to fulfil her destiny from lack of opportunity. To urge that a congenial mate cannot be selected from the five millions of starving bachelors and widowers now at large in this country is plain confession of excessive particularity, just as departure for foreign lands simultaneously with the approach of the seductive spring-time is manifest evasion of fateful responsibility.

" SIR,—I find the 'Editor's Diary' the most entertaining part of the REVIEW. Especially interesting in the last REVIEW is your explanation of the facts that there are more widows than widowers, and more divorced women than men.

" For a mere man, your reasoning is very good, but it is far from the truth. We might let it go as a joke were there not danger of some gullible youths being frightened, youths who are now blissfully floating down

the Wooing River, hoping in time to reach the open sea and the Islands of the Blest. Your reasoning might cause them to fear that the Wooing River leads to the awful whirlpool that only the lucky few escape.

" For the sake of such youths the truth should be told. Your facts are correct and your figures true; there are more widows, both grass and sod, than widowers, but your explanations are as far as possible from the true ones.

" Every young man knows he is a poor creature, earthbound, mostly made of clay, seeking something, he knows not what, till there comes a day, and such a day, when an angel in the form of a woman dawns upon his vision. Life becomes different; he longs only for her companionship; he dreams of heaven in the shape of a home for two. He wins her, gets his home, and finds it so heavenly sweet he is consumed with a longing for more heaven and more angelic companionship. His soul awakens, grows strong, flaps its pinions, and he is away, not dead, just gone up.

" With a woman it is different. She is, as we all know, a stranger to earth, a missionary, as it were, from heaven. Seeing how easily men are won and sent up, she exerts herself, making a willing, yea, a joyful, sacrifice for the sake of man's eternal good. After a time, perhaps, the strange earth things fascinate her, and she might stay on forever if her heavenly companions from whom she wandered away in early youth did not snatch her back to themselves, at a ripe old age.

" This explanation, I am sure, you will at once see, is better than yours; more cheerful and more encouraging to all young men, and might put an end to all bachelorhood.

" I am, sir, etc.,

" OLIVE GOLD SMITH.

" CHICAGO, ILLINOIS."

Regard for verity compels us to dissent regretfully from the judgment that all women are angelic while on earth; if they were, conditions would be so unequal that existence would be unendurable by man.

SATURDAY, February 23. The Essential Requisite of Reformation.

WE wish to acknowledge receipt of a great number of letters from officials of women's associations and clubs containing copies of resolutions commending our advocacy of extension of the suffrage; also of many communications protesting against the expression of our own inability to recognize the privilege of voting as an inherent right. It may be that this phase of the subject calls for special consideration, which, however, we withhold simply because, in matters of vital concern, a discussion which seems to be purely academic can be regarded only as a

waste of energy and a cause of harmful dissension. We cheerfully grant that in theory much that is convincing may be said on the affirmative side of the question; we insist also that the record of the state of comparative savagery from which the human race is slowly, but surely, emerging points in severe practice to a different conclusion; personally, we have no quarrel with those who hold the one view or the other, so the goal be the same.

It is not so long ago when members of a religious sect were firmly convinced that there was but one road to Heaven. Now there is a quite general consensus of tolerant opinion that there are many ways, and that no one of the avenues is so narrow as that solitary path once fixed by creed, prejudice or early teaching. The chief point we would make in this connection is that actual accomplishment is dependent upon ability to convince those who really possess authority, rightfully or wrongfully, of the wisdom or necessity of sharing it with others who, in point of fact at the present time, are deprived of the privilege of exercising it. Appeals to conscience and sense of fairness may be effective with some men; therefore let them be made without stint, and God speed the effort! But why impair the full force of the invocation by restriction of any kind not absolutely imposed by moral law? Frank recognition of existing conditions is the first essential requisite of reformation always. We may as well admit, then, at the outset, that the average modern man is egotistical and the average modern woman parasitical. Neither fully appreciates this simple truth, and none, of course, will admit it; but the fact remains, and is easily demonstrated by the most casual observation. The cause lies in the utter inequality between the sexes, developed by ages of presumably progressive, but surely artificial, existence. There was no such disparity in the beginning of earthly things, as we know them. Primitive man and primitive woman differed only in characteristics which have maintained to this day; in other respects they were of substantially the same rank. The chief difference lay in the fact that his nature was, and still is, destructive; while hers was, and continues to be, constructive. When he sought to kill the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air for food, she learned from the animals how to extract the poison from herbs and provide sustenance, if need should arise, through domestication of plants. His exploits were more brilliant and venturesome and, when successful, more satisfying; but

it was her work that afforded safeguard against failure, and transformed a mere chance into a certainty of existence. There ensued, as a matter of course, the equality of interdependence, the material daring and aggressiveness of the one admirably supplementing the greater patience and foresight of the other and, *mirabile dictu*, he regarding her invariably with respect, not tolerance, and she relying in no sense upon him for protection from chivalrous motives or instinct.

To trace the change wrought by what is ordinarily termed the intellectual development of the human race would surely be wearisome and quite likely unprofitable. Moreover, it might be a question not easily determined, even though we had a choice, which would be the better way of living—theirs or ours. The chief fact to reckon with for the moment is the difference, and that becomes apparent when we admit, as we must, if truthful with ourselves, that every man living to-day unconsciously assumes superiority over woman, and no living woman, at least in America, questions for a moment her inherent right to demand support and protection from man. Clearly, while such conditions continue, talk or thought of true equality is farcical to a degree, and mere expediency offers as sure a basis for argument in favor of universal suffrage as actual prerogative, if not, indeed, a surer one. But, since the opening of one road does not necessarily close another, there would seem to be no good reason for restricting choice or for bickering at the crossways.

MONDAY, February 25. Woman's Arguments Against Woman Suffrage.

“Paradoxical as it may seem to thee, O Lord!” was the beginning of the prayer of the pedagogue; and, “Paradoxical as it may seem to you, O Senators,” would have been a fitting opening of the argument advanced by certain estimable women who appeared recently before a legislative committee in Albany to voice a protest against universal suffrage. Two members of the committee to whom they appealed are the most conspicuous examples of successfully corrupt politicians in the Empire State; to them in particular was addressed the entreaty to save the commonwealth from the direful effects of ballots which might be cast by women like unto themselves. The reasons actuating the protest were set

forth succinctly, whether convincingly or not, in an "official paper," from which we quote.

1. "Would it not be an impulsive act of the New York legislator, moved by the appeals of a minority, to favor the grave social experiment of giving the suffrage to more than two millions of women whom the suffragists, after sixty years of missionary work, cannot convert into wanting it?"

In the present state of civilization, which demands chivalric treatment of presumed unequals, it is considered unbecoming to question statements of fact made by ladies; so we pass hastily over the awkward certainties that the State has less than sixteen hundred thousand male voters altogether, and that the bill objected to applied only to cities of the third class, to the main point, namely, of apprehended "impulsiveness" of the New York legislator. We would not seem impertinent, and yet may there not be reason in asking that a period of limitation of undue haste be fixed "after sixty years"?

2. "Women have been accused of being impulsive, but they are far-seeing enough to be conservative on this question. Shall the New York legislator be less conservative than the New York woman?"

If women are thus aggressively "conservative" on this question, is there any reason to doubt that they would be equally so on others no less vital? That the New York legislator should emulate one he acknowledges as his superior we cheerfully grant.

3. "The suffragists appeal to your chivalry on the ground that women need their rights and cannot get them by acts of Legislature."

Why, then, this bill?

4. "It is quite safe to assume, and perfectly easy to prove, that the New York man is the same man in his treatment of women in or out of the Legislature."

We are unable to determine whether this is intended to be a compliment or an insult. In either case the point is missing.

5. "It is exactly because the suffragist has found it easy to get whatever she wants from men outside of the lawmaking body, that she comes so confidently to you to-day."

But has she? If so, why the necessity of appearing at all?

6. "If her sex were behind her, which they are not, she would get the vote to-morrow without the trouble of personally asking the Legislature."

How?

7. "We believe that woman's non-partisan attitude gives her the opportunity for influence in the community which the suffrage would divert and curtail."

All voters are not partisans; practically no women would be.

8. "We believe that intelligence and integrity of character are more potent factors in governing woman's wages than the ballot would be."

What of it?

9. "We believe that more enduring good can be accomplished by training and moulding a child's nature than by voting on the tariff, civil-service reform, railroad monopoly or any other national or State issue."

Why not both?

10. "This is surely not a man's question; it is a woman's question. Do not act on impulse; let the women of this State decide that they want a vote before you use your official position to help make woman suffrage a law. What ten thousand women want is not the final necessity in a State of over seven million persons. Leaving out the children, there are still the views of fully four million grown men and women to be considered as either opposed to the extension of the suffrage or indifferent to it."

Why is it not a man's question; and why, particularly in puerile discussion, leave out the children?

11. "We believe that you can be trusted to defeat this resolution, and we earnestly beg you to protect our interests by your constitutional powers of check, to the end that women may continue active and beneficent in ways with which political duties would conflict."

How "interests" can be protected by deprivation of authority is beyond our ken; if, on the other hand, the conferring of suffrage rights would induce passivity on the part of women, we can perceive no reason for objection by those now so "active and beneficent" in opposition.

We dislike extremely to treat a serious subject in a manner seemingly flippant; but we know of no other method of disposing of irrelevant, illogical and childish assertions masquerading in the semblance of arguments. Nevertheless, the mere fact that so many excellent women have the courage—or should we say brazenness—to appear before notoriously corrupt politicians, even to beg that they be saved from themselves and their sisters, indicates the power for good they might wield if endowed with actual authority.